

REMARKS

Claims 5, 6 and 22 remain pending in this application with claim 22 being amended by this response for clarification purposes.

Objection to the Specification

The specification has been requested because of the many amendments made to this case. In view of the specification provided it is respectfully submitted that this objection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Objection to the Drawings

The Drawings (Figure 7) has been objected to as not displaying all the features of the present invention. In view of the attached amended figure 7 it is respectfully submitted that this objection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 22 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 22 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Dekkers et al. (US 5,550,522).

The present claimed invention recites a deflection yoke for a cathode-ray tube. The deflection yoke includes a pair of horizontal and vertical deflection coils for generating magnetic deflection fields perpendicular to a main axis of the cathode-ray tube. One of the pairs consist of saddle-shaped coils having conductive wires arranged to form a front conductor assembly and a rear conductor assembly coupled to each other by lateral conductor bundles. Those parts of each of the coils which form the rear conductor assembly and the lateral bundles are arranged approximately symmetrically with respect to a plane. A first metal plate placed near the front conductor assembly, locally modifies one of the direction and the amplitude of the magnetic field created by

the current flow in the front conductor assembly. The modification is done so that, considering a first zone of the front conductor assembly and a second zone symmetrical with the first zone with respect to the plane, the fields created in the first and second zones are not symmetrical with respect to the plane. A second metal plate is also provided. The first and second metal plates extend on both of the saddle-shaped coils of the same pair symmetrically with respect to the Z axis. The first and second metal plates locally modify the amplitude of the magnetic field with the same strength.

Claim 22 has been amended in order to eliminate the ambiguity of the wording “as first metal plate does”.

“The [present claimed] invention aims to provide a simple solution...without modifying the design of the deflection yoke” (page 6, lines 6-8). The solution solves cross modulation effects in the system that cause either orthogonality or parallelogram distortions.

Dekkers et al. disclose correction elements, for improving convergence of the three beams of a CRT, in the shape of a plurality of premagnetized elements 14. These elements 14 are premagnetized with respect to an error pattern measured on the CRT screen. Error patterns differ from one screen to another. Consequently there are an infinite number of values (magnetic strength, location) for each premagnetized element 14 disclosed in Dekkers et al. Dekkers et al. is unlike the present invention which includes “first and second metal plates extend on both of the saddle-shaped coils of the same pair, symmetrically with respect to the Z axis, the first and second metal plates locally modifying the amplitude of the magnetic field with the same strength”. In the present claimed invention, each plate modifies the magnetic field in a first zone of the front conductor assembly so that considering a second zone symmetrical with the first zone with respect to the plane of symmetry of lateral and rear bundles, the fields created in the first and second zones are asymmetrical with respect to said plane.

Dekkers et al. neither disclose nor suggest specific placement of first and second metal plate providing matching magnetic correction strengths in locations

symmetric with Z axis. Therefore, since Dekkers et al. neither discloses nor suggests “a first zone...[and] a second zone [wherein]... the fields created in the first and second zones are not symmetrical with respect to said plane [nor]...first and second metal plates locally modifying the amplitude of the magnetic field with the same strength” as claimed in claim 22 of the present invention.

Since claim 6 is dependant on claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is allowable for the same reasons as discussed above in reference to claim 22.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Dekkers et al. showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6 and 22 are not anticipated by Dekkers et al. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dekkers et al. (US 5,550,522) in view of Barklow et al. (US 3,721,930).

Barkow et al. discloses a deflection yoke for a television picture tube for use with in-line electron guns. The yoke includes vertical and horizontal coil windings. The desired convergence characteristics are achieved by winding the vertical and horizontal coil conductors such that the conductor distribution in each quadrant of a cross section of the yoke is at least in a region between 25° and 45° measured from the vertical deflection axis. Even though Barkow et al. teach of saddle-shaped coils which are vertical deflection coils, Barkow et al, similarly to Dekkers et al, neither disclose nor suggest “a first zone... [and] a second zone [wherein]... the fields created in the first and second zones are not symmetrical with respect to said plane [nor]...first and second metal plates locally modifying the amplitude of the magnetic field with the same strength” as claimed in claim 22 of the present invention. Since claim 5 is dependant on

Serial No. 09/454,875

RCA89342

claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is acceptable for the same reasons as discussed above in reference to claim 22.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Dekkers et al. in view of Barklow et al. showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6 and 22 are not anticipated by Dekkers et al. in view of Barklow et al. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits, in view of the above arguments, that the all arguments made by the Examiner have been addressed and this rejection should be withdrawn. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the present claimed invention is patentable.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Nacerdine Azzi

By: 

Jack Schwartz

Reg. No. 34,721

Tel. No. (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
January 4, 2005

Serial No. 09/454,875

RCA89342

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: January 04, 2005

Linda Tindall
L. Tindall

In the Drawings

Please replace the present Figure 7 with the attached amended Figure 7.